

Austin & Rogers, P.A.

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

WILLIAM FREDERICK AUSTIN
(1930-2016)

TIMOTHY F. ROGERS
RAYMON E. LARK, JR.
RICHARD L. WHITT
EDWARD L. EUBANKS
W. MICHAEL DUNCAN*

COLUMBIA OFFICE
CONGAREE BUILDING
508 HAMPTON STREET, SUITE 300
POST OFFICE BOX 11716 (29211)
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 256-4000
FACSIMILE: (803) 252-3679
WWW.AUSTINROGERSPA.COM

OF COUNSEL:
JEFFERSON D. GRIFFITH, III

* ALSO ADMITTED IN N.C.

May 8, 2017

VIA, ELECTRONIC FILING

The Honorable Jocelyn Boyd
Chief Clerk and Administrator
The Public Service Commission of South Carolina
101 Executive Center Drive
Columbia, South Carolina 29210

- Re:**
- May 2, 2017, Correspondence Addressed to you, from the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff, (hereinafter as, "ORS"), through its Counsel of Record, Shannon B. Hudson, Esquire.
 - The 17 Renewable Power Purchase Agreements between South Carolina Electric & Gas Company and Barnwell Solar, LLC – Docket 2016-175-E; Cameron Solar, LLC – Docket 2016-167-E; Cameron Solar II, LLC – Docket 2016-177-E; Champion Solar, LLC – Docket 2016-171-E; Estill Solar I, LLC – Docket 2016-173-E; Gaston Solar II, LLC – Docket 2016-170-E; Haley Solar, LLC – Docket 2016-178-E; Hampton Solar II, LLC – Docket 2016-169-E; Odyssey Solar, LLC – Docket 2016-181-E; Saluda Solar II, LLC – Docket 2016-174-E; Southern Current One, LLC – Docket 2015-379-E; St. Matthews Solar, LLC – Docket 2016-168-E; Swamp Fox Solar, LLC – Docket 2016-179-E; Estill Solar II, LLC – Docket 2015-378-E; Gaston Solar I, LLC – Docket 2016-172-E; Hampton Solar I, LLC – Docket 2015-380-E; and Saluda Solar, LLC – Docket 2016-182-E, (hereinafter together as, "The Projects").
 - Reference is also made to Footnote "1", from Attorney Hudson's Correspondence, Referenced Hereinabove.

Dear Ms. Boyd:

The undersigned represents all of The Projects and this correspondence is responsive to Attorney Hudson's correspondence referenced hereinabove.

The Projects do not oppose the first stated relief sought by ORS, through counsel. Namely, The Projects do not oppose, “ORS respectfully requests the Commission exercise its discretion and deny the Company’s request for confidential treatment.” Because The Projects do not oppose ORS’ first request for relief, ORS’ second request for relief, from The Projects’ standpoint, is moot (ORS’ second request for relief through counsel, was for a requirement for publication of notice).

For the record, The Projects and their Developers, reserve the right in the future to request confidential treatment for various provisions of amendments, or Agreements, which contain proprietary information.

Please advise if you need any additional information, and this correspondence is,

Respectfully Submitted,

/S/_____
Richard L. Whitt,
As Counsel for The Projects.

RLW/cas

cc: K. Chad Burgess, Esquire,
Shannon B. Hudson, Esquire,
Jeffery M. Nelson, Esquire.